

REMARKS

Claims 1, 8, 9, 15 and 17-20 have been amended. Claims 2, 10 and 16 have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1, 3-9, 11, 15 and 17-20 are now pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 102(e) Rejection:

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 8-11 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Montero et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0143958) (hereinafter “Montero”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons below.

Regarding claim 1, Montero fails to disclose that to track accesses of the attributes of the client state, the first application server is configured to store information identifying the accessed attributes of the client state of the session data. Montero teaches a system in which a central database of session data is updated with session data modified in individual application servers periodically, such as according to a certain time interval or after a certain number of changes (Montero, Abstract and paragraphs [0026] and [0049]). Montero does not teach an application server configured to store information *identifying the accessed attributes*. The Examiner, regarding the rejection of claim 2, cites paragraphs [0026], [0042] and [0046] of Montero. However, these paragraphs do not mention storing information identifying accessed attributes. Instead, paragraph [0026] summarizes Montero’s system including describing how application servers write a copy of session data to a common shared database at designated, periodic times or after a specified number of changes to the session have been made. Paragraph [0042] describes how the use of a load balance scheme may ensure that http requests in a particular session are always sent to the same application server. Paragraph [0046] merely mentions that if enough memory is not provided to hold all of the active session data, creation of a new session may result in the need to write out the oldest locally stored http session to the shared database.

Thus, none of the Examiner's cited passages mentions an application server configured to store information identifying the accessed attributes of the session data. In fact, nowhere does Montero mention storing information identifying accessed attributes of the session data. In contrast, Montero teaches only that application servers save their copies of session data to the shared session database periodically to reduce the number of writes to the database, thereby reducing strain on system resources. For instance, Montero teaches, "instead of updating the session data in the database after every request or every attribute change, each of the servers maintains a fully current copy of the http session data in its local RAM, but writes a copy of the session data to the central database only at specified intervals" (emphasis added, Montero, paragraph [0039]).

As noted above, Montero's application servers do not store information identifying the particular attributes that are accessed. Instead, an application server in Montero's system either keeps track of how long it has been since its respective copy of the session data has been copied to the session database or keeps track of the number of times its copy of the session data has been changed or both. Rather than keep track of the *particular attributes* that have been accessed, Montero refers to the number of times a local copy of session data has been changed. For example, Montero describes how a local copy of the session data may be copied to the session database "after 3 updates to the local copy of the session data" (Montero, paragraph [0049]). Montero additionally teaches comparing a "last access time" to the current time to determine whether a local copy data has been modified (Montero, paragraph [0053]). Thus, Montero's system looks as updates to the session data as a whole, but clearly does not identify individual accessed attributes of the session data. Thus, Montero's system does not include storing information *identifying the accessed attributes* of the session data. Nor does Montero provide any reason to identify particular accessed attributes of the session data.

As shown above, Montero does not anticipate an application server is configured to *store information identifying the accessed attributes* of the session data. Therefore, for at least the reasons presented above, the rejection of claim 1 is not supported by the prior

art and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Similar remarks apply to claims 8, 9 and 15.

Section 103(a) Rejection:

The Examiner rejected claims 5, 12 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montero in view of Bauer et al. (U.S. Patent 5,884,325), claims 6, 13 and 19 as being unpatentable over Montero in view of Bauer, and further in view of Morris (U.S. Patent 5,813,017), and claims 7, 14 and 20 as being unpatentable over Montero in view of Bauer, and further in view of Lin et al. (U.S. Patent 6,546,135). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of these claims for at the reasons presented above regarding their respective independent claims.

Regarding both the § 102 and § 103 rejections, Applicant asserts that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejections have been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicants hereby petition for such an extension. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-11800/RCK.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- ☒ Return Receipt Postcard
- ☐ Petition for Extension of Time
- ☐ Notice of Change of Address
- ☐ Other:

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Kowert
Reg. No. 39,255
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: August 30, 2005